

the varied strengths of the Departments of Treasury, State, and Energy, along with the SEC. This combined approach will mean that our efforts toward divestment are as fair, effective, targeted, and transparent as they can be. So I have proposed amending the divestment bill to that effect; a second amendment authorizes \$2 million to make this divestment task force a reality.

But whatever form they take, sanctions need to pass now. As the UN/AU force stabilizes Darfur, we must do our utmost to choke off the money that has oiled the machinery of slaughter. To those of my colleagues who are standing in the way of swift action, I ask:

What more do you need to see?

What more do we need to prove?

What more could it possibly take to move you?

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 180, as amended, and the two other strong Senate bills.

CROP INSURANCE

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, my comments here today are to point out the importance of the crop insurance program to America's farmers and America's rural communities.

Congress enacted legislation in 1980 that allowed for the expansion of the program and the involvement of the private insurance sector in the crop insurance program's delivery. Since this time, the program has grown from a small, experimental program to one that insures over 70 percent of the eligible acres in the country. In many States, an even higher percentage of the eligible acres in the State are insured. In my home State of Iowa we have over 90 percent enrollment. This protection has come to be relied on by farmers and their lenders as a vital and necessary part of farming. For most farmers their crop insurance policy is the basis of their risk management, crop marketing and loan collateral.

The success of the crop insurance program can be attributed to two key items. One is the support of the Federal Government. It is no secret that the Government supports the crop insurance program with premium subsidies that encourage farmers to purchase coverage and help pay for its cost. Additionally, rather than further increasing farmers' premium costs, the Government also pays for the delivery of the program. These Government expenditures, while not insignificant, are considerably less than the Government would likely spend in after-the-fact disaster aid if farmers didn't use the program or if the program didn't exist.

The second key item that has contributed to the success of the crop insurance program is the delivery of the program by the private insurance sector. Delivery of the crop insurance program by private companies, using local insurance agents, using modern technology, and with an incentive to do

things right and earn underwriting rewards, has allowed for market penetration that was thought impossible by many. But it has occurred, and it continues due to the quality, timely and accurate service being provided to farmers by local agents and companies.

I point out the importance of this program and its successes today, because this body is expected to consider this program during debate of the farm bill. It appears that despite successfully operating under separate legislation for years, the crop insurance program is being pulled into the farm bill discussions. The House farm bill has pulled money from the crop insurance program to offset other spending. I intend to analyze carefully the impact this House action will have on farmer's ability to manage their own risk. While I recognize there are improvements that need to be made to the program, crop insurance brings more stability to rural America.

American farmers deserve a safety net that they can count on each and every crop year. As the Senate prepares to work on our farm bill provisions, I hope we recognize that crop insurance has become ingrained into the fiber of American agriculture, from the farmers and lenders that depend on it to the rural communities whose local economies are bolstered by it in hard times.

BALLOT INTEGRITY ACT

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today to address an important development in the way our votes are counted. Last November, California elected a new chief election officer—Secretary of State Debra Bowen. Secretary Bowen served in the California Legislature, where she had a reputation as a dedicated advocate for greater protections of our voting systems. Upon becoming secretary of state, she called for a “top-to-bottom” review of all voting systems used in California. This was a dynamic and appropriate step, given the heartburn that electronic voting systems have caused voters nationwide.

The problems with paperless voting systems are clear. Computers are no substitute for a paper record. We want to know where our most important documents are—and we don't leave them on the computer. Votes should be no different.

Many events over the last few years have raised great concerns about paperless voting systems. In a congressional race in Sarasota, FL, about 18,000 ballots had no recorded vote. The final vote count divided the candidates by only 300-odd votes. So-called “under-votes” occur in every election. But the rate in Florida's 13th Congressional District was unusually high. And because there was no verified paper record, we may never know who really won that election.

Some say paper ballots can malfunction or be manipulated just as easily as

these computers. I strongly disagree. When paper records fail, we can see that they have failed. If paper records are stolen, or disappear, we will notice their absence. But when malfunctions or security gaps occur in paperless voting systems, there is no easy way for voters or election officials to know that something has gone wrong. It is for this reason I support optical scan paper systems—or, at minimum, voting systems that produce a paper record verified by the voter.

So it is entirely appropriate that Secretary Bowen performed this test. Californians go to the polls in 6 months to cast their votes in the presidential primary. They must have confidence in their voting systems. With the cooperation of several voting system vendors, the University of California assembled several teams to review the systems. The teams examined the systems' source code, their physical and software defenses, and the ability of people with disabilities to use these systems. The systems fell short in all three tests. In a short span of time, computer scientists identified a number of major vulnerabilities with the voting systems. And these experts were able to hack the vote in less than 5 weeks.

It is important to note that many election officials employ security measures to protect their systems from these kinds of attacks. In this test, the focus was on the voting system's defenses alone—no external protections were employed. Even without such protections, the results of this examination clearly indicate we need to improve these systems.

A few examples of what the University of California experts were able to do: First, researchers were able to gain access to the internal computer system by breaking or bypassing the locks in the voting systems. In the case of one voting system, ordinary office objects were used to gain access. Second, researchers were able to replace existing software with a new, corrupt virus that fed incorrect election data to the system. This attack used a program that appeared to change the text, but instead replaced the original software with corrupted code. Many small jurisdictions may lack the technical ability to identify and protect against these attacks. Third, while election officials can test these systems, experts noted that software distinguishes between election mode and testing mode. This could allow a virus to instruct the system to run properly during a test—but allow it to be corrupted during an election. Even counties that test their systems often could be vulnerable. Finally, the team was able to develop a device that would allow unauthorized access—and allow someone wishing to corrupt the ballot box to change the system's vote count.

What does all this mean for elections in the United States?

It means we should follow the lead of Secretary Bowen, and take a very

careful look at our voting systems. It means the argument for paper as an essential part of voting systems is becoming more and more convincing. It means we should watch and carefully assess the new standards for testing voting systems that will be employed for the first time in December. I hope these standards have a significant impact, that they catch the vulnerabilities of these systems.

I believe the bill I introduced in May will lead to great improvements in the technology and the processes of elections. The Ballot Integrity Act would immediately prohibit new purchases of paperless voting systems. By 2010, it would require a voter-verified paper record to be produced by all voting systems used in federal elections. It would ensure that laboratories that test voting systems would not be hand-picked by vendors. And it would bar wireless and internet components in voting systems. In addition, States would have to document which individuals have access to voting systems, and they would have to agree on ways to train poll workers on how to operate machinery. This approach deals with all elements of the voting process—and recognizes that good voting equipment cannot be secure without good procedures to protect the integrity of the vote.

While the debate rages over how California should respond to this new report, it is important to stick to the basics. Vote verification is the new consensus. More than half the States use paper records to preserve the vote count.

I know Americans are passionate about ensuring that their votes are counted. California has taken an important step—and uncovered some disturbing information. The Senate should support improving Federal elections by passing the Ballot Integrity Act.

RETIREMENT OF CONGRESSMAN RAY LAHOOD

Mr. OBAMA. Mr. President, I rise today to extend my appreciation and best wishes to my good friend, RAY LAHOOD, who recently announced his intention to retire at the end of the 110th Congress.

His retirement next fall will mark the end of a long, successful career representing the 18th District of Illinois—first as a staffer for 12 years for then-minority leader Bob Michel and then as a distinguished member of Congress for seven terms.

Born in the district he has represented for over 13 years, RAY LAHOOD's constituents have always been his No. 1 priority. Long after RAY leaves office, Illinoisans from Peoria to Jacksonville will benefit from his attention to local infrastructure needs, whether it is the roads, hospitals or arts projects of central Illinois.

He has been a champion for economic development in rural communities, expanded use of alternative energy, and

conservation efforts along the Illinois River. RAY and I also worked together earlier this year to help our Nation's servicemembers and veterans by introducing the Lane Evans Mental Health and Benefits Act.

But beyond his many legislative accomplishments is the distinctive spirit that RAY brought to his job. His time in Washington has been marked by a willingness to speak the truth and work across party lines—traits that have earned him the highest respect and admiration from colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

For several years, RAY hosted bipartisan congressional retreats to bring Members of Congress together for an open dialogue about ways to solve the country's problems in a civil manner. At a time in which Congress is marked by ideological warfare and harsh personal rhetoric, RAY is always searching for ways to bridge the partisan divide and find commonsense solutions to the problems facing average Americans. He was—and is—the ideal successor to Bob Michel, the great statesman who mentored him.

On a personal note, I will always be grateful to him for joining me in opening my Springfield office in January 2005 shortly after I came to the Senate. That small gesture of bipartisanship meant a lot to a freshman Senator and is a reflection of RAY's decency.

The people of central Illinois will miss RAY LAHOOD's hard work on their behalf, and I will miss his friendship.

I thank RAY for his many years of service to Illinois and to his country, and I wish him and his family all the best as he embarks upon this next chapter in his life.

TRIBUTE TO UNCLE HAROLD

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, if one is going to boast on the Senate floor, I assume I can be forgiven for boasting about close relatives.

My story is about my Uncle Harold—Harold Bach to be exact.

I called Harold last week and asked him what he had been doing. He said he had just gotten back from Minnesota. I asked, "What were you doing there?" He said, "Well I was running in the Senior Olympics events."

I guess it is not too unusual to have someone tell you that they are engaged in some track and field events. But my uncle is 87 years old. I said, "Harold, what events did you enter?" He said, "I ran in the 50 meter, the 100 meter and the 200 meter." I asked, "How did you do?" Harold said, "I won three medals—a gold, a silver and a bronze."

It wasn't news to me to hear that my uncle was running.

At age 72 Harold went to the Prairie Rose Games in North Dakota and just as a lark he entered races for age 70 and above. He easily won all three races that he entered. Then he decided, you know—I must have a talent here. It appears I can run faster than people my age. So he started running in other

States. He ran in the Minnesota Senior Olympics, he ran in the South Dakota Senior Olympics, and then he was in Arizona and California.

He never stopped running. He has now won 100 medals in Senior Olympics events across the country. At age 87, I think he is still angling for more victories.

So I am announcing today that I am going to award my Uncle Harold a certificate, designating him as the oldest, fastest runner in our State's history. No, I have not done any research to demonstrate that, but I am sure it must be true. And besides, he's my uncle.

The message in having an 87-year-old uncle that runs the 100 meter dash in under 20 seconds is inspiring to me, and I hope, to everyone else. It is a message that if you don't know what you can't do, maybe you won't be surprised if you find out you can do it, even if others think it is improbable.

None of us should be limited by our notions of what is impossible. My Uncle Harold has described what is possible for him by trying—and succeeding. It is a lesson that many of us should learn over and over again. Defeat is not about trying and failing. Defeat is failing to try. And when my uncle determined that he was faster than anybody his age, he got himself a pair of running shoes and filled his car with gas. Fifteen years later he has won 100 track and field medals.

So, hats off to my Uncle Harold! His accomplishments in Senior Olympics events are impressive and inspiring.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

CONGRATULATING MISS ASHLEY SAGISI MOSER

• Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, I congratulate Ashley Sagisi Moser, Miss Teen World United States, for her achievements in the 2007 Miss Teen World pageant. She placed first runner-up in the pageant and won the Miss Congeniality Award.

The pageant was hosted in Queensland, Australia, where representatives from 14 countries competed for the title of Miss Teen World 2007. In addition to winning the Miss Congeniality Award, Ashley placed in the top five in every category, which included Miss Talent, Miss Photogenic, Best Costume, and Best Swimsuit.

I am proud of Ashley's accomplishments, especially because she was one of the youngest contestants in this international pageant. Her stage presence and wit have allowed her to excel in pageants. She embodies the spirit of Aloha, which was noted by the judges and her fellow competitors. She represented the State of Hawaii and the United States very well.

I also want to acknowledge Ashley's impressive leadership qualities, which are evident through her involvement in one of the State's most prestigious preparatory schools, Punahou School, and